



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

compare Od. 13.141, 'Hard would it be to cast dishonor on our oldest and our best'. Such an example as Od. 6.285 may have the determined futurity meaning, "So will they talk, and for me it would prove a scandal" (Palmer). Perhaps the meaning is 'it is bound to prove'. Other examples are Il. 22.108, 17.417, 14.836, 17.105, 15.197, 9.601, 10.211-212, 24.463, 3.410, 6.410, 22.287, 24.213, 9.125, 10.57; Od. 21.322, 4.651, 9.131, 18.225, 24.435, 24.108, 11.330, 23.101, 19.569, 4.596.

Of the following questions with interrogative adverb some may have the implication of capacity and so be entitled to be included in the list given below. One example is Od. 9.351, "How should a stranger come?" (Palmer). Possibly, 'How could?' Other examples with $\pi\omega$ are Il. 19.82, 14.333; with $\pi\eta$, Od. 20.43; with $\pi\omicron\iota$, Od. 21.195; with $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, Il. 19.227.

The implication of capacity or of opportunity may appear in sentences with the optative of contingent determined futurity. The English expression for the contingent determined futurity meaning plus that of capacity is 'would be able' or 'could'. The English 'might' expresses the contingent determined futurity meaning plus that of opportunity; it has the same relation to 'may' that 'could' has to 'can'.

Here again the implication of capacity or opportunity is made most clearly by the negative. So in Il. 14.335, the sense is 'I should not go', 'I should not be able', 'I could not', 'I might not'. With first person also Il. 19.321, and, with the second, Od. 7.293. In Il. 14.247-248 the two optatives may have the *impersonal* determinant; if so, the implication of capacity appears.

Examples with the third person are more common. Compare e.g. Od. 14.123, 'No traveler would (be able to) win'. Other examples are Il. 12.448, 20.359, 14.54, 1.272, 20.247, 6.522, 4.539, 12.59; Od. 12.84, 12.107, 23.188, 12.77, 12.88, 9.242, 16.244, 23.188, 16.196, 14.197, 20.392, 13.87. A negative is implied in the interrogative sentence in Od. 8.208, 22.12, 21.259, 10.384, 3.114, 4.649; Il. 19.90.

The 'could-might' implication appears in $\pi\omega$ s questions implying a negative. In Od. 1.65 the "should" of Butcher and Lang expresses the meaning of the mood, while Palmer's "could" adds the implication. In Od. 18.31 Palmer translates by "could", Butcher and Lang by "shouldst". For Od. 15.195 Palmer uses "could", Butcher and Lang "mightest". Other examples are Od. 8.352, 12.287 ($\pi\eta$); Il. 10.243.

In positive sentences the capacity or opportunity idea is even more clearly a mere implication and not a part of the modal meaning of the verb. Sometimes the verb itself has the meaning of *successful* accomplishment of some effort, as in Od. 12.102, 'You would succeed in shooting across', 'You would be able to'. Similar are Od. 14.325 (?), 19.294 (?). Sometimes the character of the subject calls attention to the matter of ability or opportunity, as in Il. 9.57. Similar are Od. 5.74, 22.138.

Sometimes the implication is helped out by an adverb, as in Il. 16.45 by $\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$. Similar are Il. 17.70 (with $\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$),

Od. 23.188 (with $\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and a negative), and Od. 14.197 (with $\beta\eta\delta\iota\omega$ s and a negative). With $\alpha\lambda\psi\alpha$ we have Od. 15.317. Here Palmer translates with "could", Butcher and Lang with "might", and Monro (ad loc.) with "would". In the following the implication is fainter or non-existent: Od. 17.561, 13.147; Il. 13.486. In Od. 4.595 the slight implication comes from the phrase $\epsilon\lambda\varsigma \epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{o}\nu$. Butcher and Lang translate with "would". Compare the next line.

SALT LAKE CITY.

FRANK H. FOWLER.

REVIEW

A Short Historical Latin Grammar. By W. M. Lindsay. Second Edition. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1915). Pp. xii + 224. \$1.40.

The handbooks of Latin phonology and morphology which have been issued in English are not very numerous. Along with Greek, Latin was treated in King and Cookson's Principles of Sound and Inflection in Greek and Latin (1888) and in the shorter work of the same authors, An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin (1890); also in Victor Henry's Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin (translated, from the French, by R. T. Elliott, 1890). Meanwhile, the first two volumes of Brugmann's Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik der Indogermanischen Sprachen had begun to appear in an English version, with some additions and revisions, by Wright, Conway and Rouse, under the title, Elements of the Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages, in five volumes (1888 to 1895). In 1894 The Latin Language of W. M. Lindsay was published; this is the only work in English at all comparable in plan and exhaustiveness with Sommer's Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre, and with Stolz's Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, in Volume 2 of Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft¹. Professor Lindsay followed this in 1895 with an abridgment entitled A Short Historical Latin Grammar. In the same year, Professor C. E. Bennett, of Cornell University, published his Appendix to his Latin Grammar, containing a briefer treatment of the phonology and morphology than the preceding, but with very useful chapters on pronunciation, hidden quantity, and orthography. Giles's Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students also appeared in 1895, and, as its full title indicates, is especially designed for those who are interested in Greek and Latin; a revised edition came out in 1901. Bennett's Appendix appeared in 1907 in a second edition, under the name The Latin Language. Professor Max Niedermann's Précis de phonétique historique du latin was issued in an English version, edited by Professor H. A. Strong and Mr. H. Stewart, entitled Outlines of Latin Phonetics, in 1910; this work has the peculiarity of refraining from the citation of Greek words and forms. Lindsay's Short Historical

¹See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4.164; 9.111.

Latin Grammar made its appearance in a second edition in 1915. A Comparative Grammar of the Latin Language, by Professor Joseph Wright of Oxford, has long been promised by the Oxford University Press, but has not made its appearance.

In examining the second edition of Lindsay's Short Historical Latin Grammar, our first query may well be as to what changes the twenty years since the first edition have brought about. In his Preface, Professor Lindsay rightly emphasizes the importance of what he has to say on the pronunciation of *ae* in this edition (13-15)—that it was not pronounced like *ie* in *tie*, but more like the flat *a* in *hand* (American pronunciation) or *hare*; otherwise how can we explain to the pupil that *e* in *prehendo* is a shortening of *ae* in *prae*? He calls attention also to a new paragraph on *j* and *v* (8), and to added citations of forms found on the Forum Stele (31, 33, 54, 128, 180, n.). Besides these, the reviewer has noted some two hundred changes of various kinds. About forty footnotes have been added or materially enlarged. A number of words quoted as examples have been omitted, changed, or inserted. There are changes of opinion on certain words: *sas* and *sis* (83), *pole* and *mage* (134), *actutum* (143), *de* (149), *ne*, 'yes' (166). Alternative explanations have been added (*virile secus*, 140; *fortasse*, 142, n.; *quasi*, 161; *donique*, 162), and there is a tendency to avoid positive statement in many places (at least twenty passages have been found where "may be" has replaced "is" and the like of the first edition). A few errors of fact or of printing have been rectified (56, 57, 92, 158, 162). Several Plautine examples and usages have been added (137, 139, 146-147, 162, 163, 164, n.). The paragraph on dissimilation has been transferred from Chapter II, § 8, to Chapter X, § 20 (181). There are additions or alterations in the discussion of the elision of final *m* and the preceding vowel (16), of the syllabic division of words of the type *agri* (22), of the dual of nouns (42), of the genitive singular of the first declension (49), of the declension of Greek names in Latin (53, 69), of the rare ablative in *-ed* of the third declension (62), of semideponents (110), of *praesto* (134), of *eccillum* and similar words (168), of dissimilation and haplogy (182), of back-formations (193), of the perfect and the participle in vulgar Latin (197). There are a few omissions (18 = 15 of the first edition, 39 = 34-35, 104 = 90-91, 118 = 102, 134 = 117, 184 = 161, 185 = 162). Changes of dubious merit are the new etymology of *cervix* (47), the new manner of statement about the ending of the genitive singular of *o*-stems (55), the statement for the dative singular of the third declension in the tabular scheme (63), and the explanation of the ending of the second singular passive (129-131). On page 177, in the last two lines above the footnote, there are two misprints not in the first edition. An error at page 76.7, noted in the errata of the first edition, fails to receive correction in the second, at 87.10.

In Appendix A (Specimens of Early Latin), the second edition adds the Forum Stele inscription, greatly alters

the interpretation of the Duenos inscription, and takes *Samnio* in the well known Scipio epitaph to be an accusative (the first edition made it an ablative). In Appendix B (List of Spellings), the second edition omits *anguila* and directly brands *nae* as wrong for *ne*, 'verily', instead of making the latter 'better than *nae*'. A citation of a recent article has been added to the list at the end of Appendix III (208 = 183). It should be remarked that the extra 23 pages of the new edition are due in greater part to the fact that it has three lines fewer per page than the first edition had.

Such are the differences between the two editions. Are the changes adequate to bring the second edition up to date? The results of Professor Dennison's studies in syllabic division (Classical Philology 1:47-68) are not utilized on page 22; the unity of the enclitic *-ne* does not seem to be recognized at 164-167, despite Professor Anderson's recent researches (Classical Philology 9. 174-188); and Professor Sturtevant's treatise, Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin *io*- and *ia*-Stems, and of *deus*, *is*, and *idem* (Chicago, 1902), contains much that should have left an impression at various places (though such contractions seem to be ignored, except at 177, n.). The explanation of *huius* and *huic*, and other forms of the same group, is quite inadequate (89 f., 94); it can no longer be maintained that *-iei* developed to *-ii* (71; compare Brugmann, Kurze Vergleichende Grammatik, 1.255); nor that final *-nt* became *-ns* (74, 178); compare Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, § 128, and Lindsay's own listing of **dan* as a hypothetical form of the third plural (129). A reference on page 199 to the late Professor Warren's brilliant articles on the Forum Stele inscription (American Journal of Philology 28. 249-272, 373-400) would be appreciated.

The volume is designed especially for teachers of Latin Grammar who wish to inform themselves on the history of the declensions and the conjugations of the language, as the Preface states; but there are certain drawbacks. The material is not presented in a manner which facilitates ready reference. For example, the pronunciation of *b* and *g* is given on 15 and 17; but *b* in *bs* is explained at 24, and the spelling of *bl* at 151 (the pronunciation of *b* in this combination I can nowhere find), and the sound of *g* before *m* and *n* seems not to be discussed. Entirely wrong inferences as to the history of language will be drawn from such carelessly worded expressions as "Engl. eke from Goth. au-k" (157), for English is not derived from Gothic, nor did English ever borrow words from Gothic. The avoidance of technical terms may be desirable (see the Preface); yet it is rather a hardship to have phenomena described and then have no names by which to call them, as for example, rhotacism (5, 51, 59, 179), and haplogy (182), when we meet with assimilation, dissimilation, aspiration, labiovelar, by-form, and the like. We get no impression of the regular working of phonetic law, for distinct and definite formulations of the phonetic laws, even when perfectly well known, are avoided, pre-

sumably because they would make the book too difficult to understand. On the contrary, I hold that clarity is secured by brief, formulaic statements, properly set off typographically, and in these respects I find that Professor Bennett's Latin Language, despite its brevity, would be more helpful to the unassisted student of the subject than would the book under review.

From the scientific standpoint, also, some criticisms of the book should be made. The quantities of the vowels are not marked unless there is some urgent need for the marking (see, for example, 25, 29, 57). I hold that both from the scientific and from the pedagogic standpoint all long vowels should be marked in a work of this nature. The citation of a few Sanskrit forms and words would be of great assistance, such as *lāsām* in connection with the genitive plural of the first declension (51) and *trayas* in connection with *brēs* (77); these would be at least as perspicuous as Gothic forms, which are occasionally cited. There would be a gain in using the Shwa character, *ə*, rather than speaking of "another *ä*-sound in I.-Eur., which occurred in the weakened forms of roots with *Ā, Ē, Ō*" (170); and the symbol for the vocalic nasal and liquid (*n*, etc.) is rather more intelligible than *ⁿ*, etc. (175), though we must grant that here a phonetic theory may be at stake.

Besides these points, there are many errors, trifling individually, but unfortunate when they occur in numbers. The following is a selected list for a portion of the book, and includes nothing that has been already mentioned. On page 33, line 5, Professor Lindsay speaks in terms indicating that vowels may be long by position, whereas only *syllables* have such length; the same blunder is in the footnote on page 40. On page 42, in the account of the dual, *viginī* is not listed, though that word is called a dual on page 78. On page 44 the author speaks of *seni*- as the stem of *senex*, after the nominative singular, and admits *sen*- only as a possible alternative to *seni*-: but *seni*- is entirely unknown to the reviewer. Nothing is suggested (50 f.) to explain why the ending *-āi* in the first declension becomes *-ae* rather than *-ī*, as it does in the dative singular of the third declension (61). On page 51 the genitive plural of *ā*-stems is represented as ending in *-āsōm* in Indo-European, whereas that ending was a pronominal ending in Indo-European, adopted by *ā*-stems in the primitive Italic period. The history of the accusative plural of *ā*-stems is much more complicated than one infers from the short statement on page 52. The rules for loss or retention of *-os* after *r* in the nominative, as given on pp. 53 f., will not hold; moreover, *ferus* is an original *ro*-stem, not a *so*-stem, as Professor Lindsay states. The vague statement about the variation of forms in the dative singular of *o*-stems (55) might profitably have been made definite. On pages 59 f. no explanation is furnished of the length, whether purely syllabic or due to a true long vowel, in such words as *par*, which is long as a feminine in Juvenal 4.97, and as a neuter in Horace, Sermones 2.3.248. Page 61 has an incorrect mark of length on *-ēis*, intended to be

the Indo-European ending of the genitive singular of *i*-stems, and then mentions such genitives as *partus* (= *partis*) without explanation. On page 63 the ending of the accusative plural of consonant stems is said to have been originally *-ns* with vocalic *n*, though the tabulation on the next page has the correct formulation. But such a list of errors, which might be extended if omissions and infelicities were included, is but a tiresome task in preparation, and worse in the reading.

Let us turn rather to some points which are to be commended. In the account of vowel syncope and weakening (25-41), the part played by the historical accent of Latin is rightly insisted upon, where we are likely to give all the credit to the primitive Italic accent on the first syllable. The etymologies of *liberī* (48, top) and of *sine* (153) are to be preferred to the views of Walde, in his Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch (given in the first edition of Lindsay's book). To sum up, the impression which the work leaves is that of a book not readily usable, careless in expression and full of small errors, so that the student must be able to eliminate the faulty for himself before he can rely upon what he finds. And that is precisely what those for whom this brief treatment of the subject is meant will find themselves unable to do.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

ROLAND G. KENT.

Classical Articles in Non-Classical Periodicals

VI

- Annales de l'Université de Grenoble—xxviii. 2, *Simple Remarques sur la Syntaxe d'Accord en Latin*, S. Chabert.
 Athenaeum—Feb. 17, (R. L. V. Cagnat and V. Chapot, *Manuel de l'Archéologie Romaine. Tome I: Les Monuments; Décoration des Monuments; Sculpture*).
 Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia (Madrid)—Feb., *Epígrafes Romanos de la Ciudad de Adra, en la Provincia de Almería* [illustrated], F. Fita.
 Contemporary Review—Feb., *Excavations on the Palatine*, Giacomo Boni.
 Educational Review—Some Reflections on the Liberal Curriculum, Grace Goodale.
 English Historical Review—Jan., Botsford and Sihler, *Hellenic Civilization* (H. J. Cunningham); Lindsay, *Early Irish Minuscule Script*, Early Welsh Script, and Notae Latinae, and Van Hoesen, *Roman Cursive Writing* [four books reviewed by M. R. James].
 Hibbert Journal—Jan., Proclus as Constructive Philosopher, James Lindsay.
 La Critica (Napoli)—Nov., E. Rohde, *Psiche: Culto delle Anime e Fede nell'Immortalità presso i Greci* (G. Gentile).
 Museum Journal of the University of Pennsylvania—Dec., *A Red-Figured Pyxis* [illustrated], S. B. Luce, Jr.
 Nation (New York)—Feb. 1, Lord Bryce on Education [editorial on his address at the meeting of The Classical Association of England and Wales, held at the University of Leeds]; *The Ancient East and West* = (H. G. Rawlinson, *Intercourse between India and the Western World from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Rome*); *The American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, J. A. Huybers.—Feb. 15, *Domestic Architecture in Greece* = (Bertha C. Rider, *The Greek House*).
 North American Review—March, *The Entrance Requirements to Plato's Republic*, E. A. Thurber.
 Revue de l'Histoire des Religions—Sept.-Oct., P. Gauckler, *Nécropoles Puniques de Carthage* (R. Dussaud).
 Revue de Paris—Feb., *L'illusion du Préfet Mucius* [Quintus Mucius Scaurus: fiction], A. Bertrand.
 Revue Historique—Sept.-Oct., Bulletin historique: *Histoire grecque* (1911-14), 4e article, Gustave Glotz [a review of numerous books on Greek institutions, law, economic life, intellectual life].—Nov.-Dec., Bulletin historique: *Histoire grecque* (1911-14), 5e article, Gustave Glotz [a review of numerous books on Greek religion]; Pougerat, *La Pelleterie et le vêtement de fourrure dans l'antiquité* (G. Guenin).
 Rivista d'Italia—Dec., *L'Ecuba di Euripide*, G. Ammendola.
 Saturday Review—Jan. 27, (R. A. A. Beresford and E. C. Smith, *Roman Life and Customs: a Latin Reader*).